

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 20, 2009. A one-month extension of the time to respond, up to and including July 20, 2009, is filed concurrently herewith. Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgement by the Examiner that the IDSs previously submitted are being considered by the Examiner.

Claim Amendments

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to all the claims on the basis that they "appear to be direct translation[s] from a foreign language." (Official Action 2.) The Examiner further commented that the claims include "grammatical and idiomatic errors." (*Id.*) Applicants understand these comments to be directed to the form of the claims and have amended the claims to improve their form and address the objections raised by the Examiner.

Applicants have cancelled claims 22-30 and 34-37 without prejudice.

In addition, Applicants have amended claim 4 to now recite "source information including a terminal identifier." Claim 32 has been amended to now recite "source information including a unique identifier." Claim 38 has been amended to now recite "source information including identification information peculiar to the terminal." Support for the amendments to these claims may be found by reference to, for example, page 44, lines 15-29 and page 50, lines 4-15 of the specification as originally filed.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0049912 A1 to Honjo et al. ("Honjo"). (Official Action 2-3.) The Examiner also rejected claims 2-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honjo in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0172270 to Newcombe et al ("Newcombe"). (*Id.* 3-4.)

With regard to the Examiner's § 102(b) rejections, the Examiner only applied *Honjo* to claim 1. In addition, in rejecting claims 2-38 under § 103(a), the Examiner acknowledges that *Honjo* does not "disclose checking the integrity of the ticket by either the client terminal or the ticket granting server to determine whether the ticket has been changed in transmission." (Official Action 4.) The Examiner further acknowledges that as "claims 4-38 encompass [the] the same scope as claims 1-3," these claims are rejected on the same basis as those set forth for claims 1-3. (*Id.* at 4.)

Accordingly, as best understood, claims of the same scope as claim 1 are rejected as being anticipated, whereas claims of the same scope as claims 2 and 3 are rejected as being obvious. As the Examiner has not applied the references to claims 4-38, he has not set forth a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness for any of these claims. Indeed, there are several claims that recite additional features beyond those recited in claims 1 through 3. Therefore, as an initial matter, the Examiner's rejection of claims 4 through 38 "based on the reasons set forth above in rejecting claims 1-3" does not meet the requirements for setting forth a *prima facie* case under either anticipation or obviousness.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Honjo* (specifically at paragraph [0014]) discloses a server that "provides said apparatus authentication information or said source information to said apparatus authentication server or authenticating said terminal." (Official Action 3.) Applicants respectfully submit that *Honjo* does not disclose this feature as recited in claim 1. In particular, *Honjo* discloses that the www server "sends the server policy to a client having requested an access." (*Honjo* at [0014], [0052]-[0056], and FIG. 1.)

In contrast to claim 1, *Honjo* discloses that the user terminal provides the server policy to the third party authentication server. But this is not what is recited in claim 1. Rather, claim 1, as amended, recites that "said management server . . . provides said apparatus authentication information or source information to said apparatus authentication server." That is, the information is not routed through the client as is described in *Honjo*. Rather, the authentication of source information is exchanged between the two servers as is shown, for example, by lines (4) and (8) of FIG. 2 of Applicants' specification.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that *Honjo* does not disclose all the features of claim 1. In fact, *Honjo* discloses a significantly different operation than having "said management server . . . provide said apparatus authentication information or said source information to said apparatus authentication server," as is recited in claim 1. Similarly, as claim 13 as amended now recites "transmitting, by the providing server, said generated apparatus authentication information to an apparatus authentication server," *Honjo* likewise does not disclose this feature of claim 13.

Newcombe does not make up for the foregoing deficiencies in *Honjo*. Therefore, for at the least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 13 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious, individually or in combination, by *Honjo* and/or *Newcombe*. Furthermore, as claims 2 and 3, and 15 through 21 depend from, respectively, claims 1 and 13, these dependent claims are likewise distinguishable over *Honjo* and/or *Newcombe* for at least the foregoing reasons.

With regard to the other claims pending in the application, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are distinguishable over *Honjo* and/or *Newcombe*. In particular, claim 4 recites "source information including a

terminal identifier." Claim 32 recites "source information including a unique terminal identifier." Claim 38 recites "source information including identification information peculiar to the terminal." Applicants respectfully submit that neither Honjo nor Newcombe discloses the foregoing quoted feature of these claims. Further in this regard, Applicants note that claim 7 as originally filed recited "using information peculiar to said terminal" as part of the description process. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 as originally filed included allowable subject matter. In addition, as claim 33 depends from claim 32, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is now distinguishable over the prior art for at least the foregoing reasons.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he/she might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Orville R. Cockings

Registration No.: 42,424

LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

1038834_1.DOC